United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/660,561	09/12/2003	Jeong-Wook Lee	030681-572	5312	
	7590 05/14/2007 INGERSOLL & ROONE	EXAMINER			
POST OFFICE BOX 1404			MULPURI, SAVITRI		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			· ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2812		
					
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/14/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/660,561	LEE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Savitri Mulpuri	2812	

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Savitri Mulpuri	2812						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATI	ION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWA	NCE.						
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods: a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing 	wing replies: (1) an amendment, affortice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in content of the content	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE (06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN					
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply original three months after the mailing date.).	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offite of the final rejection,	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as even if timely filed,					
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complishing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed. 	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th						
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below.)	onsideration and/or search (see NO	•	ecause					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	etter form for appeal by materially re		the issues for					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
 4 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 6 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a):							
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected to: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	•	II be entered and an e	explanation of					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		•						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, by because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeary and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).					
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	Savitri Mulpuri	M.					
	•	Savitri Mulpuri Primary Examiner						

Art Unit: 2812

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Tsakalakos does not teach sequentially growing semiconductor layer, mask layer and metal layer and regrowing the semiconductor layer completely fill the nanoholes in the mask and extend above the mask to cover the mask layer. However, Tsakalakos teaches all the limitations except forming metal layer. Zhang teaches metal layer and etching metal layer by anodization to form nanoholes in the mask and removing the anodized metal layer. It would have been obvious to one of ordianry skill in the art to form nanoholes in the mask in the invention of Tsakalakos by using metal layer followed by anodization instead of forming and etching block copolymer layer to form nanoholes, which eventaully aid to form nanoholes in the mask. The goal in both Tsakalakos and Zhang is to form mask with nanoholes and both chose different methods to form nanoholes, which are analogus. However, in both references the final structure is the substrate covered with mask having nanoholes. In other words, copolymer layer in Tsakalakos and metal layer in Zhang are eventually removed once nanoholes are formed within the underlying mask layer and then finally regrow the semiconductor layer in the nanoholes and above the mask.